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**PAGE 7**

Line 29: I found two sentences were omitted here from previous manuscript versions. The sentences address a data comment brought up by the peer review and presentation of the manuscript. The co-author Boss added these two sentences to address peer data comment. Co-author Boss placed sentences at the end of the paragraph as follows:

“Note that data that were negative within the uncertainty of the derived products were left in the data. Removing such data will bias aggregated statistics.”

**PAGE 10**

Line 64: Please add the missing sentences added previously by the co-author Schaeffer in response to peer review.

“…. Milli-Q deionized water as a reference. The samples were the filtrate from 0.7 um nominal pore size GF/F filters to avoid a size fraction gap between the traditional 0.2 um pore size for ocean CDOM measures and 0.7 um pore size for particulate absorption measures. Reported CDOM absorption values will be higher than the range traditionally reported for oceans because of the larger size fraction and sample station locations including estuary river systems. Total particulates…”